

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections contained in the Office Action of November 13, 2008 is respectfully requested.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 36 have been amended. Thus, claims 1-55 are currently pending in the application. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 1 and 36 as containing informalities. In this regard, it is noted that claims 1 and 36 have been amended so as to include each of the corrections suggested by the Examiner in items 2 and 3 of the Office Action. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's objections are not applicable to amended claims 1 and 36.

Further, on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner asserted that it is unclear whether the term "periphery" in claim 36 is referring to the periphery of the resonator or to the periphery of the cylinder body. In this regard, it is noted that claim 36 has been amended to recite the "periphery of the cylinder body." Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's formal rejection under § 112 is not applicable to amended claim 36.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Suenaga (US 2002/0066272). On pages 3-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bland et al. (US 7,080,514). For the reasons discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that the amended claims are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a gas turbine combustor having a cylinder body, comprising an air-container body which accommodates air for resonance for fluid particles serving as vibration elements of combustion vibration, a junction body having a predetermined length and which has one end thereof open to the cylinder body and has the other end thereof open to the air-container body, and a transverse body having vents where the fluid particles cross internal of the junction body and vibrate by resonance. Further, claim 1 recites that the air-container body forms a closed space excluding an opening only through the junction body, and

the transverse body is disposed inside the junction body.

Suenaga discloses a gas turbine combustor which, as shown in Fig. 1, includes an inner cylinder 2 and a cylinder tail 9. Suenaga also discloses an acoustic liner 16 formed around the cylinder tail 9, and that cooling grooves 13 and sound absorption holes 14 are formed in the wall of the cylinder tail 9. In this regard, it is noted that on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that the inner cylinder 2 corresponds to the cylinder body of claim 1, the acoustic liner 16 corresponds to the air-container body of claim 1, the sound absorption holes 14 correspond to the junction body of claim 1, and that the cylinder tail 9 corresponds to the transverse body of claim 1.

However, Suenaga does not disclose a gas turbine combustor in which *the transverse body is disposed inside the junction body*, as required by independent claim 1. Rather, Suenaga merely discloses that the sound absorption holes 14 (*i.e.*, the junction body, as interpreted by the Examiner) are formed in the wall of the cylinder tail 9, and does not disclose a transverse body inside the sound absorption holes 14, and therefore Suenaga does not disclose a gas turbine combustor in which the transverse body is disposed inside the junction body, as required by independent claim 1. Further, it is noted that Suenaga does not disclose a junction body which has one end thereof open to the cylinder body, as required by claim 1, because Suenaga only discloses a sound absorption hole 14 formed through the wall of the cylinder tail 9.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Suenaga does not anticipate amended independent claim 1.

Bland discloses a resonator assembly which, as shown in Fig. 6A, includes a scoop 50, and a resonator 14 secured to the outer periphery of a combustor component 24. In this regard, it is noted that on pages 3-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that the scoop 50 corresponds to the air-container body of claim 1, that the resonator plate 18 of the resonator 14 corresponds to the junction body of claim 1, and that the combustor component 24 corresponds to the transverse body of claim 1.

However, Bland does not disclose that *the air-container body forms a closed space excluding an opening only through the junction body*, as required by independent claim 1.

Rather, Bland discloses that the scoop 50 includes openings 20 into the resonator 14 as well as an opening 55 through the sidewall to the exterior. Therefore, the scoop 50 of Bland does not constitute an air-container body which forms a closed space excluding an opening only through the junction body, as required by independent claim 1. Further, Bland does not disclose that *the transverse body is disposed inside the junction body*, as required by independent claim 1. Rather, Bland discloses that the resonator 14 (*i.e.*, the junction body, as interpreted by the Examiner) is fixed to the outer periphery of the combustor component 24 (*i.e.*, the transverse body, as interpreted by the Examiner), and therefore does not disclose that the transverse body is disposed inside the junction body, as required by independent claim 1.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Bland does not anticipate independent claim 1.


Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, as well as claim 36 which depends therefrom, are clearly allowable over the prior art of record. Additionally, as claims 2-35 and 37-55 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-35 and 37-55 are also allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is clearly in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kazufumi IKEDA et al.

By: 

Walter C. Pledger

Registration No. 55,540

Attorney for Applicants

WCP/lkd
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
May 13, 2009